

REMARKS

The Examiner, in paragraph 1 of the Official Action, has objected to the drawings stating that they fail to show necessary textual labels of features, or symbols or elements in Figures 1, 2a-2d, 3 and 4. Applicant does not understand the Examiner's objections to the drawings. Applicant is required to show each and every detail of the claimed invention where necessary for an understanding of the present invention. In the instant application, Applicant has indeed disclosed all of the elements of the claimed invention and has specifically set forth specific elements in the drawings identified by numerals as discussed in the specification. In addition, Applicants, in order to assist the reader, has provided a parts list identifying the elements set forth in the drawings. It would appear that the Examiner is suggesting that descriptive labels for each of the elements also be placed in the drawings. However, Applicant does not understand how this is required or necessary. The specification clear sets forth all the elements in the drawings and describes all of the elements in the specification. The two sections cited by the Examiner deal with regard to use of graphical symbols that are typically used in drawings, or when legends may be used. In the instant case, the adding of textual information that are represented by numerals and clearly discussed in the application are not believed to be required or necessary, but instead appear to be redundant. It is believed that Applicant has met the duty of providing appropriate drawings as required by 37 CFR 1.83. If the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assessment, Applicant respectfully requests an explanation as to what is missing in the drawings.

Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define and distinguish the present invention over the prior art. In particular, independent claims 1, 7, 19 and 20 have been amended as indicated, and claims 12-18 and 21-25 have been cancelled from the subject application. The invention as currently set forth is directed to a method computer software product for entering data into a searchable database that provides a first display screen having a plurality of predefined selection items relating to features of a stored object file, (for example, a real estate property as set forth in independent claim 19). The claims further set forth that a user is able to select one of the predefined selection items for entering into a predetermined searchable field in a searchable database and is associated

with the stored object file (e.g. the real estate property). The claims further set forth the repeating of the selection process until all the selections have been made with respect to the predefined selection items and have been filed in predetermined searchable fields on the searchable database.

The present invention is directed to providing a searchable database in which items can be more easily classified, categorized and be easily searchable. Predefined selection items are provided to make it quick and easy to categorize so that the selected items can also be used to find classified objects. The hierarchal selection process/database set forth by the claims allows the quick and easy entry of various predefined selection items and associate these items with a particular object file. Preferably the selection items are represented by selection buttons 85, 90, 95 and/or icons that make it easy for the user.

The Examiner, in the Official Action, rejected claims 1, 7, 12 and 19-20 as being anticipated by Orapps reference for the reasons set forth in paragraph 2. Applicant respectfully submit that the Orapps reference does not teach or suggest the present invention. The reference to pages 1-8 and pages 1-13 simply deal with navigating through files in a system. In the present invention an object file is associated with various selectable items that are searchable. There is no teaching or suggestion of associating searchable selecting items that have been associated with an object file. The tree structure of Orapps reference is simply directed to how file folders are set up and stored and how these files are stored with respect to each other. There is no discussion of predefined selection items relating to features of a stored object as taught and claimed by Applicant. As set forth by the claims, these predefined selection items are entered into a predetermined searchable field in a searchable database and is associated with the subject object file. Thus, each of the selected items is searchable such that a search can be conducted of various of the selected items to identify stored object files falling within the scope of the search. This is not taught or suggested by Orapps. Page 119 merely discloses a menu bar for storing of information. There is no teaching or suggestion of categorizing based on selected items relating to stored object files as taught and claimed by Applicant. The "Find" function set forth on page 1-8 is simply defining what files that are identified. Thus, use of the "Find" function of the Orapps reference would locate that particular file. In the

present invention each of the selectable items are put in a predetermined searchable field. There is no teaching or suggestion of doing this in Orapps.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submit that the Orapps reference clearly does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submit that the remaining references do not teach or suggest anything that would render any of the independent claims obvious. The remaining cited references do not add anything that would render the independent claims, as currently set forth, obvious.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/phw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2728
Facsimile: 585-477-4646